

PATENT  
Atty Docket No. 10014834-1

### REMARKS

A final Office Action dated January 7, 2004 allows claims 4-8 and 16-20, and rejects claims 9,10, 13-15 and 21-31. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks:

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102(e)


Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's rejection of claims 9, 10, 13-15 and 21-31 as being anticipated by Swanson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,646,665) under 35 USC § 102(e).

In addition to the earlier grounds for allowability asserted in applicants' November 14, 2003 amendment, applicants note that all of the currently rejected claims also include the combination of allowable elements set forth in the examiner's "Reasons For Allowance" provided in the January 7, 2004 final Office Action.

Namely, the examiner has indicated as follows:

"The combination or method as claimed wherein said cover preventing said back end from operably engaging said back end engaging portion of said mount before said toe-end is pivotally secured to said toe-end engaging portion of said mount is not disclosed, suggested, or made obvious by the prior art of record."

[January 4, 2004, Final Office Action, page 4, lines 9-12]



PATENT  
Atty Docket No. 10014834-1

As best shown in Fig. 4 of Swanson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,646,665) above, the back end of the printer component in Swanson must be secured within the mount before the toe end is positioned below the cover and secured to the mount. The examiner's "Reasons For Allowance" appears to recognize this characteristic of Swanson.

In contrast to Swanson, claim 9 of the present application calls for the back end to be secured to the mount only after the toe end is positioned below the cover and operably secured to its respective mount. Namely, independent claims 9 and 10 both include a limitation that "said toe-end must be positioned under said cover before said back end is secured to said mount." (emphasis added).


Since this element is missing from Swanson et al., it cannot anticipate claims 9 & 10, and therefore they should be allowed. Moreover, since dependant claims 21-30 depend on allowable claim 9 or 10, they too should be in condition for allowance.

Similarly, independent claim 15 includes the limitation of "a cover operably secured to said mount extending partially over said ink reservoir chamber such that in order to allow said toe-end to operably engage said mount, said toe-end must be positioned under said cover and within said ink reservoir chamber before said back end is secured to said mount . . ." (emphasis added). Since this limitation is missing from Swanson and all other references of record, claim 15 cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious by them. Accordingly, independent claim 15 and dependent claims 13, 14, and 31, which depend on it, should also now be in condition for allowance.

PATENT  
Atty Docket No. 10014834-1

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that all of the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request that this amendment be entered and the case passed to issuance. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact applicants' attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John R. Dawson  
Registration No. 39,504

March 8, 2004

**ipsolon llp**  
805 SW Broadway # 2740  
Portland, Oregon 97205  
Phone No. (503) 419-0702  
Fax No. (503) 249-7068  
E-Mail: [john@ipsolon.com](mailto:john@ipsolon.com)